



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,264	10/22/2001	Mark H. Lucovsky	3090	9015

7590 03/21/2005

LAW OFFICE OF ALBERT S. MICHALIK, PLLC.  
704-228TH AVENUE NE  
SUITE 193  
SAMMAMISH, WA 98074

EXAMINER

STEVENS, ROBERT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021,264

Applicant(s)

LUCOVSKY ET AL.

Examiner

Robert M Stevens

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/4/04, 9/20/04 + 1/24/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-5 are pending in Application No. 10/021,264, entitled "Schema-Based Services for Identity-Based Access to Calendar", filed 10/22/2001 by Lucovsky et al. Claims 1 and 4 are independent.

2. The Office acknowledges three Information Disclosure Statements filed on 6/4/2004, 9/20/2004 and 1/24/2005.

#### ***Priority***

3. Applicant claims benefit of provisional application 60/275,809 filed 3/14/2001.

#### ***Office Comments***

4. The Office notes that while Applicant was given 2 months to file an oath/declaration in the Notice to File Missing Parts (NFMP) dated 1/17/2002, that Applicant did not file such missing documentation until 3/17/2002. Applicant failed to request an extension of time of 1 month, pursuant to 37 CFR 1.1.36(a) and as set forth in the NFMP, and thus is in arrears as to the payment of the appropriate fees.

#### ***Double Patenting***

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed.

Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. **Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting** as being unpatentable over claim 6 of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0131073 (Application Ser. No. 10/017,680). This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: the use of schemas in the implementation of a calendar service application.

**Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:**

**Regarding claim 1:** Claim 6 of the conflicting application (10/017,680) is directed to a method in which the services schema of claim 1 (10/017,680) corresponds to a calendar service. Written as such, claim 1 of the instant application is an obvious variant of claim 6 (10/017,680).

These claims differ in that claim 1 of the instant application is “receiving a data access request directed to contact information”, whereas claim 6 (10/017,680) is “receiving a data access request directed to service information”. Claim 1 of the instant application appears to be only stating a subset of the information (i.e., contact information) required to implement claimed services of both the instant application and application no. 10/017,680. Refer to the first sentence in the Abstract of 10/017,680 indicating that this application discloses a “schema-based **contacts** service for Internet access to per-user contact data, wherein access is based on each user’s identity”. Thus claims 1 (instant application) and 6 (10/017,680, the conflicting application) are not patentably distinct from each other.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include contact information in claim 1, because such contact information allowed for access of a requested service by the appropriate requesting (i.e., contacting) entity.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. **Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

**In regards to independent claim 1**, this claim recites the terms/phrases “calendar schema” and “logical calendar document”. One skilled in the art would equate these documents (i.e., a schema is a data model, and therefore logically represents the actual data). The use of such terminology renders the claim vague and indefinite.

**Claims 2-3** are dependent upon claim 1 and therefore likewise rejected.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Wang et al (US Patent No. 6,018,343, filed Sep. 27, 1996, hereafter referred to as “Wang”) in view of Michael Morrison et al., XML Unleashed, Sam’s Publishing, Indianapolis, IN, Dec. 1999, pp. 26-37, 84-104 and 106-122., hereafter referred to as “Morrison”).

**Regarding independent claim 1**, Wang discloses:

*In a computer network (col. 1 lines 5-6), a method comprising:*

*...;*

*receiving a data access request directed to contact information, the request including associated identity information; (code at col. 7 lines 38-60) and*

*in response to the data access request, manipulating at least one set of data in a logical calendar document that includes data therein according to the associated identity information (code at col. 7 lines 38-60), ... .*

However, Wang does not explicitly disclose:

...  
*providing a calendar schema, the calendar schema having calendar-related fields arranged into a content document with defined structures for the fields;*

...  
*..., each set of data in the logical calendar document structured to correspond to a field in the content document.*

Morrison, though, discloses:

...  
*providing a calendar schema, the calendar schema having calendar-related fields arranged into a content document with defined structures for the fields;* (Use of schemas to model a class of data is well known in the XML programming art, as described on p. 26 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph under “XML Data Modeling Basics”. Additionally, the p. 33 Listing 2.3 shows a schema with defined structures for fields.)

...  
*..., each set of data in the logical calendar document structured to correspond to a field in the content document.* (p. 33 Listing 2.3 shows a logical address book document, it being a matter of obvious design choice what type of document is logically modeled.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Morrison for the benefit of Wang, because to do so would enable machine validation of document structure, as taught by Morrison in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of p. 27. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web based programming.

**Regarding claim 2**, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed. Wang further discloses:

*wherein manipulating at least one set of data comprises reading data from at least one field (code at col. 7 lines 55-60) ... .*

However, Wang does not explicitly disclose:

*... in the logical calendar document.*

Morrison, though, discloses:

*... in the logical calendar document. (p. 33 Listing 2.3 shows a logical address book document having fields, it being a matter of obvious design choice what type of document is logically modeled.)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Morrison for the benefit of Wang, because to do so would enable machine validation of document structure, as taught by Morrison in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of p. 27. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web based programming.

**Regarding claim 3**, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed. Wang further discloses:

*wherein manipulating at least one set of data comprises writing data to at least field (code at col. 8 lines 22-27) ... .*

However, Wang does not explicitly disclose:



*... in the logical calendar document.*

Morrison, though, discloses:

*... in the logical calendar document. (p. 33 Listing 2.3 shows a logical address book document having fields, it being a matter of obvious design choice what type of document is logically modeled.)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Morrison for the benefit of Wang, because to do so would enable machine validation of document structure, as taught by Morrison in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of p. 27. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web based programming.

**Regarding independent claim 4, Wang discloses:**

*In a computer network (col. 1 lines 5-6), a method comprising:*  
*receiving a request to retrieve calendar data, the request including*  
*associated identity information; (code at col. 7 lines 38-60)*  
*reading from a data store to obtain calendar data based on the associated*  
*identity information; (code at col. 7 lines 45-60)*  
*... ; and*  
*returning the document in response to the request. (col. 6 line 65 – col. 7*  
*line 8)*

However, Wang does not explicitly disclose:

...

...

...

*constructing a calendar document including at least part of the data, the*  
*document arranged according to a defined schema for calendar data; and*

...

Morrison, though, discloses:

...

...

...

*constructing a calendar document including at least part of the data, the document arranged according to a defined schema for calendar data; (Use of schemas to model a class of data is well known in the XML programming art, as described on p. 26 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph under "XML Data Modeling Basics". Additionally, the p. 33 Listing 2.3 shows a schema with defined structures for fields.) and*

...

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Morrison for the benefit of Wang, because to do so would enable machine validation of document structure, as taught by Morrison in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of p. 27. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web based programming.

**Regarding claim 5**, which is dependent upon claim 4, the limitations of claim 4 have been previously addressed.

However, Wang does not explicitly disclose:

*wherein the schema includes at least one defined field for extending the schema.*

Morrison, though, discloses:

*wherein the schema includes at least one defined field for extending the schema.* (p. 93 section entitled "The name and model Attributes" discusses an open model architecture, which provides for a very extensible schema.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Morrison for the benefit of Wang, because to do so would enable

Art Unit: 2176

machine validation of document structure, as taught by Morrison in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of p. 27.

These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web based programming.

### **Conclusion**

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Such prior art is considered to be relevant to the current application, but has not been rigorously analyzed/weighed as to whether it could be used to set forth stronger arguments regarding prior art rejections. This action does not disqualify any cited prior art from use in future proceedings.

### **Non-patent Literature**

Morrison, Michael, et al., XML Unleashed, Sam's Publishing, Indianapolis, IN, Dec. 1999, pp. 26-37, 84-104 and 106-122.

Padwick, Gordon, Special Edition, Using Microsoft Outlook 2000, Que Corporation, Indianapolis, IN, May 1999, pp. 370-376, 382-386 and 392-396.

"Hailstorm Announcement", Bill Gates' Speech, Mar. 19, 2001, pp. 1-25, downloaded from: [www.microsoft.com/billgates/speeches/2001/03-19hailstorm.asp](http://www.microsoft.com/billgates/speeches/2001/03-19hailstorm.asp).

### **US Patent Application Publications**

Lucovsky et al	US2003/0131073
Ramachandran et al	US2003/0140112
Mui et al	US2003/0229529
Fish	US2003/0220891
Helgeson et al	US2002/0049749
Friedman et al	US2002/0154161
Mansikkaniemi et al	US2002/0065881
Mansikkaniemi et al	US2002/0063732
Rapp et al	US2002/0116232

### **US Patents**

Lange et al	6,839,733
Blants	6,732,080


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Stevens  
Art Unit 2176  
Date: March 4, 2005

rms



**SANJIV SHAH**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**